

REMARKS

Prior to this Amendment, Claims 1-8 were pending in this application. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,808,224 to Kato in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,328,272 to Kuramochi et al. (hereinafter, "Kuramochi"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,906,494 to Ogawa et al. (hereinafter, "Ogawa").

As indicated above, the Specification and Claims 1-8 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Claims 1-8 are now pending, with Claims 1 and 6 as independent claims.

Regarding the §103(a) rejection of independent Claim 1, which recites, "a waveform shaping unit for shaping the waveform of the key data signal" this claim is patentable over Kato, Kuramochi, and Ogawa. Regarding this limitation, the Examiner merely states, "Kato discloses... a waveform shaping the waveform of the key data signal...(See Col. 7, 35-50)." (Office Action, page 2). However, the cited passage of Kato does not include any reference to a waveform shaping unit or shaping a waveform of a key data signal. Further, Kato does not include any reference to a waveform shaping unit or shaping a waveform of a key data signal. Therefore, Kato does not teach, disclose, or suggest the above-quoted limitation of Claim 1.

Kuramochi and Ogawa do not cure the deficiencies of Kato. All of the claimed features of independent Claim 1 are not taught or suggested by the combination of Kato, Kuramochi, and Ogawa or by either reference alone. Therefore, Claim 1 is patentable over Kato, Kuramochi, and Ogawa. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Regarding §103(a) rejection of independent Claim 6, which has been amended to incorporate limitations from independent Claim 1 to recite, “waveform shaping the demodulated key data signal,” Kato, Kuramochi, and Ogawa do not teach, disclose, or suggest this limitation of amended independent Claim 6 for at least the reasons stated above regarding independent Claim 1. Therefore, amended independent Claim 6 is patentable over Kato, Kuramochi, and Ogawa for at least the reasons stated above regarding independent Claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of Claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5 and 7-8 are dependent claims, and are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons given above with regard to their respective independent Claims 1 and 6.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-8 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant’s attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas M. Owens, III

Reg. No. 51,314

Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, LLP

290 Broadhollow Road, Suite 210E

Melville, New York 11747

Tel: (516) 228-3565

Fax: (516) 228-8475